



NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING SERVICE CENTER
Port Hueneme, California 93043-4370

Special Publication SP-2067-SHR

QUANTIFYING SOUND COATING ADHESION



by
C. Dave Gaughen

March 2000

20000818 171

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DEED QUALITY INSPECTED 4



Printed on recycled paper

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-018

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)

2. REPORT DATE

March 2000

3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

Final; March 2000

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

QUANTIFYING SOUND COATING ADHESION

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)

C. Dave Gaughen

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center
1100 23rd Avenue
Port Hueneme, CA 93043-43708. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT
NUMBER

SP-2067-SHR

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESSES

Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center
1100 23rd Avenue
Port Hueneme, CA 93043-437010. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT
NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

Painting contractors, specification writers, and field inspectors each require singular values for use in quantifying sound coating adhesion. These values would simplify acceptance criteria for new coating systems and, prior to maintenance painting, facilitate identifying sound, but weathered exterior coating systems. To quantify sound coating adhesion, a portable adhesion tester may be used in accordance to several industry standards. This report presents cohesive strengths of substrates and pull-off strengths of coatings; explains how to determine sound initial adhesion; identifies additional parameters which should be quantified prior to maintenance painting; and lists examples of premature failures due to unsound field adhesion.

14. SUBJECT TERMS

Coatings, paint, substrate, adhesion, cohesion, adhesive strength, cohesive strength, stress, overcoat, maintenance painting, NFESC

15. NUMBER OF PAGES

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
OF REPORT

Unclassified

18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
OF THIS PAGE

Unclassified

19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
OF ABSTRACT

Unclassified

UL

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Painting contractors, specification writers, and field inspectors each require singular values for use in quantifying sound coating adhesion. These values would simplify acceptance criteria for new coating systems and, prior to maintenance painting, facilitate identifying sound, but weathered exterior coating systems. To quantify sound coating adhesion, a portable adhesion tester may be used in accordance to several industry standards. This report presents cohesive strengths of substrates and pull-off strengths of coatings; explains how to determine sound initial adhesion; identifies additional parameters which should be quantified prior to maintenance painting; and lists examples of premature failures due to unsound field adhesion.

Findings are as follows:

- Substrate (non-metallic) and coating adhesion may be successfully quantified using a portable adhesion tester.
- Sound initial and weathered coating adhesion, in general, is governed by the material (substrate or coating) having the lowest cohesive strength.
- Coating adhesion ≤ 110 psi is questionable and can, under the right circumstances, lead to premature coating failures.
- A value for sound weathered adhesion is relative and is primarily dependent upon the properties of the selected overcoat(s).
- To prevent overcoat failures, the selected overcoat should display the following properties: A) Glass Transition temperature range ($T_{(g)}$) less than the $T_{(g)}$ of the weathered coating, B) Cohesive strength considerably lower than the weathered coating's adhesion, C) Combined Residual Cure Stress and hygrothermal stress significantly less than the weathered coating's adhesion, and D) Sustainable flexibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
COHESIVE STRENGTH.....	1
SOUND INITIAL ADHESION.....	2
SOUND WEATHERED ADHESION.....	3
EXAMPLES OF UNSOUND FIELD ADHESION.....	4
AIR FORCE BASE, LOUISIANA.....	4
RESERVE CENTER, WASHINGTON.....	4
NAVAL AIR STATION, TEXAS.....	4
SUMMARY.....	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
REFERENCES AND ENDNOTES.....	6

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Cohesive Strength of Substrates.....	2
Table 2: Pull-off Strength of Industrial Coatings.....	2

INTRODUCTION




Fig. 1 – Portable adhesion testers with pull-off coupons: L) Dyna tester, R) Elcometer™.

Painting contractors, specification writers, and field inspectors each require singular values for use in quantifying sound coating adhesion. These values would simplify acceptance criteria for new coating systems and, prior to maintenance painting, facilitate identifying sound, but weathered exterior coating systems. To quantify sound coating adhesion, a portable adhesion tester (Fig. 1) may be used in accordance to one of the following industry standards: A) ISO 4624 (International Organization for Standardization), or B) ASTM-D-4541 (American Society for Testing and Materials)^{1,2}. The ISO standard is designed primarily for laboratory adhesion testing whereas the ASTM standard may be used in either a laboratory or field environment. However, when coating adhesion has been quantified, what values represent sound adhesion? This report presents cohesive strengths of substrates and pull-off strengths of coatings; explains how to determine sound initial adhesion; identifies additional parameters which should be quantified prior to maintenance painting; and lists examples of premature failures due to unsound field adhesion.

COHESIVE STRENGTH




Fig. 2 – Cohesive failures on pull-off coupons: L) Asphaltic concrete attached to a marking paint, R) Acrylic topcoat over epoxy primer.

When a coating is applied to a substrate, adhesion is generally governed by the material (substrate or coating) having the lowest cohesive strength (Fig. 2). For example, when

epoxies are applied to metal and tested for adhesion, the epoxy is weaker and fails well before the metal. Conversely, when the same epoxy is applied to concrete, the epoxy is stronger and adhesion testing typically produces a concrete cohesive failure.

A material's cohesive strength is quantified by testing for either tensile strength or pull-off strength and values represent the material's maximum internal strength. Table 1 lists the cohesive strength of substrates commonly painted and Table 2 lists the pull-off strength of various industrial coatings.

Table 1: Cohesive Strength of Substrates

Aluminum	$\geq 15,500 \text{ psi}^{(3)}$
Asphaltic Concrete @ 63°F	$240 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Concrete	$\geq 200 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Concrete Masonry Unit (CMU)	$\geq 180 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Plywood	$\geq 180 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Polyurethane Foam (PUF)	$90 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Steel	$\geq 56,000 \text{ psi}^{(4)}$
Stucco	$\geq 50 \text{ psi}^{(6)}$
Zinc	$\geq 33,000 \text{ psi}^{(5)}$

Table 2: Pull-Off Strength of Industrial Coatings (ASTM-D-4541)⁷

Acrylic, Direct to Metal	500 psi
Alkyd Primer	300 psi
Alkyd Topcoat	290 psi
Alkyd, Silicone	295 psi
Epoxy, Coal Tar (SSPC Paint 16)	1000 psi
Epoxy Polyamide	750 psi
Epoxy Polyamine	840 psi
Epoxy, Water Based	600 psi
Epoxy, Zinc Rich	1000 psi
Inorganic Zinc	310 psi
Urethane, Aliphatic	600 psi
Urethane, Moisture Cured	600 psi

SOUND INITIAL ADHESION

The following two coating systems illustrate the limiting factor associated with sound initial adhesion: System 1) Silicon alkyd topcoat, alkyd primer, plywood substrate, and System 2) Zinc-rich epoxy primer, epoxy polyamine intermediate coat, moisture cured urethane topcoat, steel substrate. Using Table 1, plywood and steel display minimum cohesive strengths at 180 psi, 56,000 psi, respectively. Using Table 2, the silicone alkyd topcoat is slightly weaker than the alkyd primer (295 psi vs. 300 psi) while the moisture cured urethane is the weakest component of System 2 (600 psi vs. 840 psi, 1000 psi). Consequently, System 1 displays maximum adhesion at $\geq 180 \text{ psi}$ (value at which plywood cohesive failures occur) whereas System 2 displays maximum adhesion at 600 psi (value at which moisture cured urethane cohesive/adhesive failures occur). If either System was specified, adhesion values could be used to generate acceptance criteria for sound initial adhesion. However, specifying a value for sound initial adhesion also

requires a minimum cure period and a temperature range for performing the adhesion testing. For thermosetting epoxies and urethanes, a cure period of one week is usually sufficient and the temperature for adhesion testing is generally not a concern ($\approx 40^{\circ}\text{F} - 90^{\circ}\text{F}$). For thermoplastic alkyds and acrylics, a cure period of several weeks may be required and adhesion testing should be performed as close to room temperature as possible ($\approx 70^{\circ}\text{F}$).

SOUND WEATHERED ADHESION




Fig. 3 – A shim bending technique may be used to Quantify a coating's Residual Cure Stress and Hygrothermal Stress.

In theory if each coat of a weathered coating system's adhesion is $\geq 85\%$ of its value for initial adhesion, coating adhesion may be classified as sound⁸. Still, a quantitative value for sound adhesion is relative and is primarily dependent upon the properties of the selected overcoat(s). When an overcoat has been selected, certain overcoat stresses should be quantified and used for comparison against the weathered coating's adhesion. For example: 1) Residual Cure Stress (RCS: initial coating stress transferred to a substrate/coating during the paint's cure), and 2) Hygrothermal stress (stress transferred to a substrate/coating from both service temperatures and moisture induced swelling). If the selected overcoat transfers a combination of RCS and hygrothermal stress either exceeding or equal to the weathered coating's adhesion, premature failures from lifting and/or intercoat disbonding may result. The RCS for a common epoxy, as determined by Shimbo et al, ranges from 672 psi to 974 psi (8 mils dry, rm. temp.), whereas hygrothermal stress for an acrylic polyurethane, as determined by Perera et al, ranges from 39 psi (105°F) to 413 psi (72°F)^{9,10}. The above epoxy and urethane stress values each exceed alkyd adhesion (Table 2) and, if either paint is applied as an overcoat to an alkyd system, failure may result. To quantify either a singular coating's or coating system's RCS and hygrothermal stress, the CoRI-Stressmeter or an equivalent device may be used¹¹. (Fig. 3)

In addition to the above stresses, the selected overcoat's glass transition temperature range ($T_{(g)}$) should be significantly lower than the $T_{(g)}$ of the weathered coating. A material's $T_{(g)}$, according to Pappas et al., is defined as the temperature at which there is an increase in the thermal expansion coefficient¹². As a coating weathers, the $T_{(g)}$ becomes elevated and internal stress can increase¹³. Consequently, using an overcoat

with a $T_{(g)}$ lower than the weathered coating generally minimizes intercoat stress through increased flexibility, decreased hardness, decreased cohesion, and decreased tensile strength¹⁴. In the field, a coating's $T_{(g)}$ may be quantified by extracting a 1/4" to 1/2" paint chip and sending it to a laboratory employing a Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC: ASTM-E-1356).

Using coating System 2 as an example, sound weathered adhesion is displayed at ≥ 510 psi (600 psi initial urethane adhesion $\times 0.85$) and overcoating with a flexible paint having a cohesive strength $\ll 500$ psi should not present a problem. When viewing Table 2, the silicone alkyd and alkyd topcoat meet the above cohesive strength requirement with values at 295 psi and 290 psi, respectively. These values are well below System 2 weathered adhesion and, if applied as an overcoat, represent the maximum Residual Cure Stress (RCS) transferred to a coating system¹⁵. Although the alkyds satisfy the cohesive strength requirement, sustainable flexibility is also required of the overcoat. Alkyd coatings, in general, initially display moderate flexibility, whereas over time flexibility decreases and internal stress increases. This effect is undesirable and, for weathered coating System 2, a more appropriate overcoat selection may be an elastomeric acrylic displaying a cohesive strength of 300 psi and a percent elongation from 150 % to 350 %.

EXAMPLES OF UNSOUND FIELD ADHESION

The three examples presented below show that coating adhesion ≤ 110 psi is questionable and can, under the right circumstances, lead to premature coating failures.

Air Force Base, Louisiana

A "dry fall" alkyd coating was applied to the underside of a sheet metal roof at three times the manufacturer's recommended thickness and displayed an adhesive strength ≤ 100 psi¹⁶. Due to the synergistic effects of high humidity, significant thermal loading/sheet metal expansion, and excessive thickness, the alkyd coating was lifting from the roof in sheets. The alkyd coating was 100 % removed and reworked using two coats of an elastomeric acrylic.

Reserve Center, Washington

Two coats of a Direct to Metal (DTM) acrylic were applied to a weathered alkyd system over galvanized sheet metal and displayed an average DTM/alkyd intercoat adhesive strength of 90 psi¹⁷. Due to the DTM acrylic's high cohesive strength (> 500 psi), the alkyd's low/weathered cohesive strength and thermal loading effects, the DTM acrylic exhibited various degrees of intercoat lifting and peeling. The coating system was allowed to continue failing until it became aesthetically displeasing and was to be 100 % removed and reworked with an epoxy primer followed by a topcoat of aliphatic urethane.

Naval Air Station, Texas

A four-coat, 20 mils dry, hangar floor coating system was applied to shot-blasted concrete and displayed on average an unsound adhesive strength of 110 psi¹⁸. Due to the combined effects of the excessively thick topcoat applications (solvent entrapment) and incomplete intercoat mixing, the primer was transformed back into its uncured state

(chemical incompatibility) and exhibited numerous spot failures. The coating system was spot repaired and has provided somewhat acceptable performance.

SUMMARY

- Substrate (non-metallic) and coating adhesion may be successfully quantified using a portable adhesion tester (ASTM-D-4541 or equivalent).
- Sound initial and weathered coating adhesion, in general, is governed by the material (substrate or coating) having the lowest cohesive strength.
- Coating adhesion ≤ 110 psi is questionable and can, under the right circumstances, lead to premature coating failures.
- A value for sound weathered adhesion is relative and is primarily dependent upon the properties of the selected overcoat(s).
- To prevent overcoat failures, the selected overcoat should display the following properties: A) Glass Transition temperature range ($T_{(g)}$) less than the $T_{(g)}$ of the weathered coating, B) Cohesive strength considerably lower than the weathered coating's adhesion, C) Combined Residual Cure Stress and hygrothermal stress significantly less than the weathered coating's adhesion, and D) Sustainable flexibility.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank Mr. Joseph Brandon (Protective Coating Specialist: Navy) for technical improvements, and Ms. Nicoletta Panigutti for editorial support.

REFERENCES AND ENDNOTES

1. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). "Paints and Varnishes: Vol. 1 – General Test Methods." Switzerland, 1994.
2. American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). West Conshohocken, PA.
- 3,4,5. American Society For Metals. "ASM Metals Reference Book." 1983 (pp. 308, 211, 375, respectively).
6. Testing performed by the author using either the Elcometer or Dyna Tester. Results represent the average of two or more tests.
7. Sherwin Williams Product Data: Industrial and Marine Coatings' Catalog.
8. Theory based on author's experience.
9. Masaki Shimbo, et al. "Effect of Solvent and Solvent Concentration on the Internal Stress of Epoxide Resin Coatings." JCT, Vol. 57, No. 728. September, 1985.
10. Dan Y. Perera and Maarten Oosterbroek. "Hygrothermal Stress Evolution During Weathering in Organic Coatings." JCT, Vol. 66, No. 833. June, 1994.
11. Annelies E. Boerman and Dan Y. Perera. "Measurement of Stress in Multicoat Systems." Journal of Coatings Technology: Vol. 70, No. 881, June 1998.
12. S. Peter Pappas et al. "Organic Coatings: Science and Technology." John Wiley & Sons, 1999 (pp. 13).
13. Dan Y. Perera and Maarten Oosterbroek. "Hygrothermal Stress Evolution During Weathering in Organic Coatings." JCT, Vol. 66, No. 833. June, 1994.
14. Clive Hare. "Protective Coatings: Fundamentals of Chemistry and Composition." Technology Publishing Company, 1994 (pp. 405).
15. Statement based on author's experience.
16. C. Dave Gaughen. "Investigation of Large Maintenance Hangar Coating Failure on Interior Steel, Barksdale Air Force Base." Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center (NFESC). March, 1999.
17. C. Dave Gaughen. "Inspection of Coating Failure on a Standing Seam Awning." NFESC. July, 1997.
18. C. Dave Gaughen and Theresa A. Hoffard. "Failure Analysis of the Hangar Floor Coating System at Bld. 1048, NAS JRB Dallas Fort Worth, TX." NFESC. August, 1999.